

SB 343 Fact Sheet/Introduction

SB 343 was authored by a diverse group of beauty industry professionals including school owners and employers. As you can see on the Fact Sheet I've handed out, they are some of the largest employers of beauty professionals and responsible for several hundred mostly women being trained for employment in one of the fastest growing industries.

While you're likely to hear opposition from the Board of Barbers & Cosmetologists, the bill is not an indictment of the job the Board or the Department of Labor & Industry. We support their efforts.

However, their objection is really Exhibit A in why this legislation is necessary; as the group of business owners with the most investment in the industry and responsible for preparing several hundred professionals for fulfilling careers, we need a stronger voice and more diverse opinions to be considered.

What does the bill do?

1. On page 2, line 3; the number of members on the board reserved for school owners is expanded to three from two. There are many types of schools; some are large, others affiliated with national chains, some accredited and who take students receiving financial support and others not. The diversity demonstrates the need for more voices.
2. On page 2, line 12; the appointments will be submitted by a professional association for the governor's consideration.
3. On page 2, line 28; All beauty instructors are required to take continuing education to maintain their instructors licenses. Industries and instructor skills must evolve. The proposed language allows employers to determine what constitutes education when it comes to their employees.
4. On page 3, line 3; There are numerous changes coming to the beauty industry. This proposed change recognizes that need for various jurisdictions to cooperate just as local government must be able to work with state government. As it is, educators can find themselves trapped between the Department of Education and the Board or even administrative rules.
5. On page 3, line 21; This reverses legislation passed in 2011 that is overly restrictive and prescriptive with respect to how cosmetology schools hire employees. Schools have diverse training methodologies to integrate educators into their schools and are in the best position to determine what they need in employees. Furthermore, many licensed cosmetologists cannot discontinue their employment for 650 hours and pay for education.
6. The changes regarding professional recommendations were staff driven.
7. On page 5, line 11; expands to 650 the hours of instruction required for the practice of manicuring. This change is requested by current employers of nail

technicians, instructors, and even current students who recognize that the existing 400 hours is insufficient and less than what most states require. While this will increase the cost of attaining licensure for nail technicians, many support it because they will be able to earn a living more quickly when they enter the field.